8.

FALSHOOD UNMASKT,

In ANSWER to a BOOK,

CALLED,

TRUTH UNVEIL'D.

Which vainly pretends to justify the Charge of

Mr STANDISH,

Against some Persons in the Church

OF

ENGLAND.

By a Dutiful SON of that CHURCH.

LONDON,
nted for *James Magnes*, and *Richard Bentley*
at the *Post-Office* in *Russel-street*, in
Covent-Garden, 1676.

Imprimatur

Novemb. 3. 1676.

Ab. Campion.

To the AUTHOR OF THE VINDICATION OF Mr. STANDISH'S SERMON, &c.

SIR,

BEing at this time not far from *London*, I have met with a little Pamphlet, called *The Truth unveiled*, &c. (which you pretend to be a Vindication of Mr. *Standiſh*'s Sermon) a great deal ſooner than otherwiſe I ſhould have done. The Pamphlet it ſelf, doth not ſeem to me to be worthy of any regard: but to your ſelf who ſeem to be much concerned for the ſafety of our Religion, there is a great one due, and therefore in mere charity to you, I have once more ſet Pen to Paper; briefly to demonſtrate that you wrong your ſelf exceedingly in imploying your time about works of this nature; for which you are not at all fitted. You are *a Perſon of Quality*; I make no doubt, becauſe I have your word for it; but I muſt take the boldneſs to tell you; that whatſoever other qualities you have, you are not qualified (to imitate a little your way of writing) to paſs a cenſure on Men, and on Books, as you have taken the liberty to do,

You will be apt, it is like, by this blunt beginning, to make the ſame judgement concerning me; but I truſt I ſhall evidently ſhow, it is no raſhneſs or preſumption in me, to undertake this task; which is ſo eaſy, that it requires no great abilities to make good this charge, *viz.*, *That there is a notorious defect, either in your Will and Affections, or elſe in your Mind and Judgement*: either of which make you unmeet to meddle with theſe matters.

The former of theſe I dare not ſuſpect, becauſe you profeſs *down-right Honeſty*, though *no Arts*; and in many paſſages ſpeak very piouſly. Though I cannot forbear to ſay thus much, that the conſtant affectation of little ſtrains of the loweſt and pooreſt ſort of witty reflexions, is no good ſign of that *ſerious inſide Piety*, whoſe *Heart-bloud*, you ſay, is now *letting out* by a Generation of Men, for whom you cannot find a name bad enough. Who can read without ſome diſdain, ſuch pittiful punns as you have made upon the names of ſeveral perſons: which I doubt you would not allow in another, while you take a great liberty this way your ſelf. You would call it, I have reaſon to think, flurting and fleering, or lightneſs and vanity, if not jeering and abuſiveneſs in thoſe whom you take to task; which you practice without any ſcruple, from the beginning of the Book to the end. Mr. *Bull* comes firſt with his *Horns*, and *eager puſhes* pag. 33. having lately *puſht apiece into the World*. p. 37. Then Mr. *Baxter* is deſcribed by the character of one, *who hath ſpoiled in his time many good Bakings*. And elſewhere Dr. *Heylin*, paſſes under the name of *St. George his Champion*, and you doubt *his Dragon too*. And there is another, I am confident you aim at, when, upon the mention of Dr. *Owen*, and Mr. *Jenkins*, you tell us of the *groveling outcries that are made*. Nor can I deviſe any other reaſon, why you contracted the name of your Book in the entrance, with an *&c.* (when it ſtands at length enough in the Title Page) but only to bring in the far-fetcht conceit

of

of the *Oath*, &c. Sure, Sir, this trifling is not to be *a practitioner of Piety in* Baley's way, nor *to watch over your actions according to* Brinſley's *Rules*, and as you direct us, p. 30. If it be, thoſe Books, and the reſt you commend to our uſe, do not ſurpaſs ſo far as you would have the world believe, the labours of *the New Speaking Gentlemen*. So you call the Writers you oppoſe, though that excellent Man Dr. *Hammond* (after whom follows Biſhop *Taylor*) *leads the Van*, as you ſpeak, and was the *Forelorn Hope*. Who deſerved ſure to be treated with more Reverence, eſpecially by a *Perſon of Quality*, who ought not to have ſtooped to ſo low, ſo paultry, a way of writing, nor to have comprehended ſo great a Divine, and ſo Holy a Man, under no better Name, than that of *a New-Speaking Gentleman*.

But you *do not deny, but there are abundance of excellent, uſeful, ſeaſonable, well-ſaid things* in his *Practical Catechiſme*. and therefore, notwithſtanding all this, I doubt not but you are (though I know not who you are, no more than the Man in the Moon) a Pious, Serious, Honeſt Gentleman, or Perſon of greater Quality) who intends to do ſervice to Religion; though you are not well skilled in the buſineſs you go about.

For that there is an exceeding great defect in your judgement, it is apparent from hence, That pretending a Vindication of Mr. *Standiſh* his Sermon, you have not writ one ſyllable to the purpoſe. For the Men whom he informs againſt, and whoſe names I deſired we might know, are ſuch *as impiouſly deny both our Lord, and his Holy Spirit: who make Reaſon, Reaſon, Reaſon their only Trinity: who preach up Natural, and Moral Religion, without the Grace of God, and Faith in Chriſt:* and in effect ſay, *There is no ſuch thing as ſupernatural Grace*. That is in plain terms, rank *Socinians*; or worſe, (if worſe can be) for the *So-*

cinians do not advance Natural Religion againſt the Chriſtian, , nor deny all Supernatural Grace. Now I did not, nor do believe that there is a man to be named among our Clergy, who is guilty of theſe foul deteſtable Hereſies. Yes, ſay you (or you ſay nothing) ſince you call *ſo loudly and importunately, for a Bill of particulars*, you ſhall have it. And the firſt Names you give in, are Dr. *Hammond* and Biſhop *Taylor*. Who muſt therefore be the Ring-leaders of thoſe *deceitful Workers*, thoſe *falſe Apoſtles* Mr. *Standiſh* ſpeaks of; or elſe (to ſpeak mildly, in one of your own phraſes) *you have miſt the Quiſhion*. Chuſe you which of theſe you will; it is certain you will be found, to be an incompetent perſon to interpoſe your ſelf in thoſe differences; though I doubt not you are, as in humility you ſtile your ſelf, p. 34, *A well-meaning Scribler*.

Do you really intend to charge thoſe great Men with the crime of *Socinianiſme*? Is the *Practical Catechiſme* in effect but the *Cracovian*, in which Mr. *Standiſh* feared *we might live to ſee our Youth trained up*? Hath any one more effectually eſtabliſhed the Doctrine of the *Holy Trinity*, than the ever memorable Dr. *Hammond*, upon the 1 Epiſtle of *S. John*, the fifth Chapter, and the ſixth Verſe? I believe I may anſwer for you, that you did not mean to impute any ſuch Hereſies to either of them. And therefore it remains, if you acquit them, that you condemn your ſelf of the groſſeſt impertinency, and heedleſsneſs, in naming theſe, as the Heads of that black Faction. For if you can lay things together, you will ſee that this muſt be your meaning; or you did not mind what you wrote about: but having ſomething in your Head, concerning innovations in our Religion, regarded not how you applyed it. Look over *the earneſt requeſt to Mr.* Standiſh; read the character of the Men, a Liſt of whom I deſire him to communicate; and then apply it to Dr. *Hammond*, and Biſhop *Taylor*, and

you

you will *very hardly hold* (to ſpeak your own language again) from asking your ſelf that queſtion, which you obſerve p. 29. Sir *John Sucklin* ask'd, when he found Sir *Toby Matthews* in the Seſſion of Poets, *What do they here?*

Perhaps, you will as earneſtly reply, have I not alledged a ſtrange paſſage out of one of Biſhop *Taylors* Prayers? What do you ſay to it? I ſay I have taken notice of it my ſelf, and do not know what he meant; but I am ſure he was no *Socinian*, and that there is no *Socinianiſm* in the words you quote, whatſoever there be elſe; and therefore I know not what you meant to thruſt them in here, where they have nothing to doe. There is no man of the Church of *England*, I believe, that will anſwer for every word in that great Mans Writings: But no more will any diſcreet Man of your way, anſwer for all the hard ſayings that are in Mr. *Calvins*. I am ſure I find in my ſmall Reading, the greateſt Men, who have undertaken his defence, abſolutely diſclaiming their being bound to make good every thing that he ſaid; and therefore had it been more pertinent than it is, you might have let it paſs, and not have diſturbed Dr. *Taylors* aſhes (as they ſpeak) but ſuffered a perſon of his merit, to ſleep in peace.

But ſome of thoſe that follow, perhaps may be of the *Racovian* ſtamp; though theſe two be found as innocent, as all you have ſaid about them, is impertinent. Let us try if you pleaſe, what you have to ſay to *St. George* his Champion, who next follows? If we ſhould allow him to have been, as you doubt, his *Dragon* too; we ſhall never find him ſpitting any ſuch venome, as that mentioned in Mr. *Standiſh*'s Sermon. You your ſelf cannot charge him with any ſuch thing; but detain your Reader only with a long tedious reflection (in XVII. Particulars) upon his *Cy-*

priani

prianus Anglicus, or, The Life of our Great Archbiſhop *Laud*, which ſtill ſhows that you are beſide the Cuſhion, and *without queſtion*, expect (as you ſay of him) *that Readers ſhould reſt upon your Dictates, without any ſearching* whether you write to the purpoſe or no: *or elſe you would never have ſo determinately* called your Book, *a Vindication of Mr.* Standiſh's *his Sermon, which in truth is far otherwiſe.* It would have ſaved you a great deal of needleſs pains, if you would but have minded the laſt words of my Requeſt to him (which are not mine, but the wiſe Son of *Syrach's* 11 Ecclus. 7.) *Underſtand firſt, and then rebuke.* You would not have troubled us, if you had heeded this good counſel, with a ſtory of his *Arminianiſme, ſtrutting through all the pages of his Book*; which is no more to the *Vindication* you undertake, *than the myſterious agency of* Panzani *and* Con (which you talk of afterward) and *that which was a doing* (I know not when) *at* Clerkenwell, *and behind* Drury-lane.

Nor hath the *Ghoſt* of *Tilenus*, whom you bring in next, any thing to ſay about the buſineſs. It is only a dumb apparition; and we have nothing but your word for it, that *it makes very irregular glances, and would let out the hearts bloud of ſundry truly Proteſtant Doctrines*. All that follows it likewiſe is but wind, againſt *Parker, Hickringale, and ſweet Mr.* Sherlock (as you are pleated in much civility to term him) whoſe Writings you ſay, *contain not much more than Sophiſtical Harangues, Perſpicuous Calumnies, and Prodigious Drolleries.* What that *much more* is, you will not let us know; It is like that, as little as you think it, it contains a confutation of your accuſations. For one of thoſe perſons whom you rank with them, *Georgius Bull*, I am acquainted withall, and know him to be both an Holy, and a very Learned perſon, who hath in his laſt Book, thrown off this charge of *Socinianiſme*, with

with as much indignation, as you can do the Writings of any of the *New ſpeaking Gentlemen.* And there is no body that knows him, but is aſſured, he moſt ſincerely declares his inmoſt thoughts: and would not for a world embrace any Doctrine, contrary to what hath been taught by the *Catholick* Church; with which he is certain the Church of *England* is not at odds.

But why do I make ſo many words about this ſort of Writers? Our Books of Devotion will not down with you neither; but, upon this, that is no occaſion, fall under your laſh. If they do but omit any thing, which you would have in them, ſtraitway you quarrel, and think it a ſufficient reaſon for your diſpleaſure at them. *The method and direction for private Devotion*, is not for your Tooth. And which is more, the *Whole Duty of Man*, is not ſecure from your impotent aſſaults, p. 29. and 32. We muſt uſe no other Books but ſuch as you like; or elſe quit our Title to the name of the right Sons of the Church of *England.* Inſtead of the excellent Book laſt named, we muſt buy the *Practice of Piety* (though far more liable to exceptions in many wiſe mens judgements, than any Book of Devotion you have mentioned) or elſe you will not be in a good humor. What an imperious, dictating Spirit is this (which rules in Men of this ſtrain) who will not allow us ſo much as to ſpeak out of their phraſe? Is this the Spirit *of true genuine Calviniſme*, which you ſo highly commend, p. 28? Are thoſe that carp at every thing, and can reliſh nothing, but what is of their dreſſing, nor fancy any body, but thoſe that are exactly of their own cutt, *the righteſt Sons and Fathers of the Church of* England? ———

Why (will you here, I fancy, interrupt me, and be apt to ſay) what have you to object againſt what I have writ, *That an Epiſcopal Calviniſt is the righteſt Son, or Father of the Church of* England, *the beſt Proteſtant; and (if a good man) the beſt Chriſtian?* p. 28. I anſwer, if you will not

count

count me impertinent for medling with that, which was not my preſent buſineſs with you, I have very much to object. And firſt I ſay, that no right Son, much leſs, Father of the Church of *England*, will endure to be called, or thought, either a *Calviniſt*, or an *Arminian*: for our Church follows no particular man, though never ſo great; neither *Calvin*, nor *Luther*, nor *Arminius*. None of theſe are the founders of its Faith: which is not taught by *Calvin's*, or any other *Inſtitutions*; but by the Holy Scriptures interpreted by the Church of Chriſt, in the beſt ages of it. Or (to give it you in the words of an once Father of this Church) *interpreted, not according to the fancies, and moſt what preſumptions of ſome one man, delighting commonly to oppoſe and thwart the ſtream of antiquity; but according to the ſenſe and meaning of thoſe times, that drew water nearer unto the Well-head; that is, to the Apoſtles, and their ſucceſſors immediately.*

Upon which ſcore it is certain, that the Doctrine of this Church cannot be *Calvinian*. For the firſt and pureſt ages, by which it is guided, you your ſelf are ſenſible was not ſo; only you think it ſufficient to ſmile at thoſe who pretend their Authority, and ſay, *It is little leſs than ridiculous to talk of the Fathers before* St. Auſtin's *time, in reference to thoſe queſtions.* p. 25. Why ſo, I beſeech you? *Becauſe they lived*, ſay you, *before the Controverſie was ſtarted; and ſo did not, nor could intend to ſpeak appoſitely to the points of Original ſin, the power of Grace*, &c. By which reaſon we muſt not appeal to them in the points about *Popery*; for then the pretences of *St. Peter* were not on foot, *&c.* and then they could not intend to ſpeak *appoſitely* to ſuch matters. I ſhould think thoſe great Lights of the Church ought not to be thus ſlighted, in a matter of ſuch moment. And an indifferent perſon would, for your reaſon, conclude the quite contrary; that they are the more to be heeded, becauſe they are the more likely to have delivered purely their

their ſenſe without any bias, when they were not engaged among themſelves in the heats of controverſy; which too oft pervert the underſtanding. And thoſe Doctrines which ſubvert Mr. *Calvins* Syſteme, were ſo certainly believed by them, that they made no controverſy of them: but with one conſent rejected the Doctrine of *Fate*, which was then no leſs rife among the Pagans (againſt whom they were careful no doubt to write *appoſitely*) than the *abſolute irreſpective Decrees* are now among Chriſtians.

But beſides this, I am alſo certain, that the Sons and Fathers of the Church of *England*, have oppoſed this Doctrine long before Mr. *Hoord* appeared; who you ſay, was the firſt that ventured to give our *Britiſh* world, new notions of *Gods love to Mankind*. This is ſo palpable an untruth, that Biſhop *Hoopers* Works ſhew theſe notions which you call *New*, are as *Old* as the Reformation. And a Sermon Preached at *St. Pauls Croſs*, on the 27 of *October* (as the Title Page informs me) *Anno Reginæ Elizabethæ* 26. by *Samuel Harſnet*, is ſuch an illuſtrious teſtimony againſt you, that there cannot be a greater. He was then but *Fellow of* Pembroke-Hall *in* Cambridge; but afterward promoted to be one of the *Fathers* of the Church, in King *James* his time, and at laſt advanced to be one of our *Primates*; for he dyed *Arch-Biſhop of York*. I ſuppoſe, Sir, a Perſon of your Reading, who undertakes *to trace the crooked muddy ſtream*, as you call it, *to its firſt weak ebullitions*, cannot be ignorant of the ſtrong *efforts* (to uſe your own word) made by this Preacher; Who expreſsly makes the Doctrine, which Mr. *Hoord* long after oppoſed, a daring enemy riſen up againſt our *Iſrael*. For he expreſly calls it a *Goliah*, which was *grown huge and monſtrous*, reviling not the Hoſt of the living God, but the Lord of Hoſts. And mentioning thoſe words of *St. Paul*, [*God would have all men to be ſaved*] tells that numerous Auditory *the Genevian conceit hath dealt with this Gracious*

See Mr. Bull.

 bounty

bounty of God, and this bleſſed ſaying [God would have all men to be ſaved] *as* Hanun *did with the Ambaſſadors of* David. *He cut off their Garments to the Hips; and this hath curtail'd the Grace of God to the ſtumps: For it ſaith, it muſt not be meant that God would have every living ſoul to come to Heaven; but one or two,* perhaps, *out of every order and occupation. But the Spirit of* St. Peter (*a great deal wiſer than that of* Geneva) *ſaith plainly, God would not have any one periſh, &c. I truſt we ſhall have Grace to believe him, ſince himſelf can better tell what himſelf would have, than the men of* Geneva *can.* What think you now after this downright Declaration (which I have tranſcribed a ſmall ſcrap of, out of that Sermon, on 33 *Ezek.* 11.) was Mr. *Hoord* the firſt man that ventured to teach *Gods love to Mankind,* in a way quite oppoſite to that of the *Calvinians*? Is not here a man that boldly tells the *Britiſh world* in the greateſt Aſſembly it had, that your beloved Doctrine is a ſtranger, nay an enemy to our Church: ſtrutting indeed about at that time, and bearing it ſelf high (as you ſpeak of Dr. *Heylins* Arminianiſme) ſo that Men trembled and ſhak'd at it; but by him reſolutely endeavoured to be caſt down, as a forreign conceit, which ought not to be admitted here. We know very well, how it came to ſpread and *grow ſo huge and monſtrous*; but it was then no more the ſenſe of the Church of *England*, than *Arianiſme* was the ſenſe of the Church Catholique, when all places were over-run with it. There were ſtill more than *one* who had the ſame reſolution with *Athanaſius*, to bear witneſs againſt it; as I could ſhow out of good Authors.

And I can ſee no cauſe why Biſhop *Mountague* (whom, as becomes a true courſe *Calvinian*, you call bare *Mountague*, and therefore the reſt, by the way, need not take it ill they are no better treated) ſhould be quite ſtruck out of the number of thoſe, from whom we may learn the notions of our Church in his dayes. For I can find no State-

Politicks

Politicks in his Book (which you pretend for his rejecti-on) but as he aſſures us, *the proper, true, and antient te-nents of the Church of* England; *ſuch as be, without any doubt or queſtion, legitimate and genuine, ſuch as ſhe will both acknow-ledge and maintain for her own*: So he avows in his *Epiſtle Dedicatory*, to His late Majeſty, before his *Apello Cæſarem*. And there is no reaſon to think him partial in this caſe; ſince Dr. *Francis White*, then Dean of *Carliſle* (no mean Champion ſure of our Church) teſtified as much, after he had been authorized by King *James*, to read that Book over duely, and give his judgement of it, which is this, as you may ſee in his *Approbation*, or Licenſe of it for the Preſs, 1624. that having diligently peruſed it, he found nothing therein *but what is agreeable to the Publique Faith, Doctrine and Diſcipline eſtabliſhed in the Church of* England.

Now mark what this Writer ſaith to thoſe that inform-ed againſt him. *You would make the world believe* (as you, Sir, indeavour alſo to do) *That the Church of* England *Calvinizes: ſhew me good warrant for it, and I yield, I may rather ſay that the Church of* England *hath oppoſed this Do-ctrine, becauſe that many of the Learned (your ſelves will not deny) in that Church, and moſt conformable unto the Diſci-pline and Doctrine of the Church, have mainly oppoſed it.* You may find this lively teſtimony againſt you, in the *Firſt* Part, the *Seventh* Chapter: towards the concluſion of which, he further adds, *I am ſure it hath been oppoſed in the Church of* England; *otherwiſe taught and profeſſed in the Schools, when I was an Auditor there. It hath been prohibited to be enjoyned, and tendred, or maintained, as the authenti-cal Doctrine of our Church, by ſupreme authority; with ſharp reproof, unto thoſe that went about to have it tendred, than when thoſe concluſions or aſſertions of* Lambeth (which you mention) *were upon ſending down to the Univerſity of* Cam-bridge.

This is ſufficient ſure to convince you of your error; or if it be not, let me add, that Biſhop *Davenant* himſelf (who you do but hope, *reduced Mr.* Hoord *to a ſounder mind*, for I can prove the contrary) in his *Lent Sermon* before the King, and the laſt I think that he preached, declared his opinion to be, *as for Univerſal Redemption, ſo for Univerſal Grace within the Church.* Which I doubt, the *Calvinians* will not allow; I am ſure thoſe that are called *Arminians*, deſire no more. You may find this, if you pleaſe, in Dr. *Hammond's* Letters to Biſhop *Sanderſon*, concerning Gods Grace and Decrees, p. 27. and I hope you will take his word in a matter of Fact, for a greater thing than this.

But if all this will not be regarded, yet I preſume the Church it ſelf will be allowed to underſtand its own ſenſe, *which hath directly, and in expreſs words* (ſaith the forenamed Biſhop *Mountague*, in that Book, Licenſed by the Kings Authority) *overthrown the ground of* Calviniſme, *in Teaching thus: that a juſtified man, and therefore predeſtinate in your Doctrine, may fall from God, and therefore become not the Child of God*, p. 59. which he repeats again p. 73. *The Church holdeth, and teacheth punctually (and that in the opinion, and with the diſlike of the Learneſt of your ſide) that Faith, true, juſtifying Faith, once had, may be loſt and recovered again: that a man endued with Gods Holy Spirit, may loſe that* HOLY SPIRIT, *have that Light put out, become like unto* SAUL *and* JUDAS, &c. How can the Church of *England* then be thought, even in your own underſtanding, to be *Calvinian*; which teaches things ſo croſs to Mr. *Calvins Hypotheſis*, that they utterly overturn it? And it had been very happy if they that endeavoured to bend ſome other Articles of our Church to his ſenſe, had rather ſtudied, as they ought to have done, to frame their ſenſe in all other things to this Article, which is directed ſo expreſly againſt what he teaches. This Church then would have been in a better condition than it is; being

ing

ng now in danger to be deſtroyed by thoſe, who were never quiet, till with the Doctrine, they had brought in the Diſcipline too of Mr. *Calvin* among us. Thoſe are memorable words of Biſhop *Mountagues* (whom if he had been yours, you would have gone near, upon ſuch an occaſion, to have ſtiled a Prophet) which we meet with in the *Fifth* Chapter, of the *Firſt* Part of his *Appeal*, where he charges thoſe that informed againſt him, with *waving* the Doctrine of our Church, *Preaching* againſt it, *Teaching* contrary to what they had ſubſcribed, *that ſo*, ſaith he, *through FORRAIN DOCTRINE, being infuſed ſecretly, and inſtilled cunningly, and pretended craftily to be the Churches; at length you may wind in with FORRAIN DISCIPLINE alſo, and ſo fill Chriſtendom, with Popes in every Pariſh for the Church, and with popular Democracies and Democratical Anarchies in the State.* If you pleaſe to reflect upon our late confuſions, and compare them with this *Prediction*, perhaps you may hereafter love Biſhop *Mountague* better, as a perſon of ſome judgement and ſagacity in other things, as well as in this.

But I liſt not to trouble the Reader with any unpleaſant reflections upon thoſe diſmal times, I will rather upon this occaſion, refreſh him with a tale, as King *James* called it, in the Conference at *Hampton Court*, p. 82. There was a time, ſaith he, when Mr. *Knox writes to the Queen Regent of* Scotland, *telling her, that ſhe was Supream head of the Church, and charged her, as ſhe would anſwer it before God's Tribunal, to take care of Chriſts Evangel, and of ſuppreſſing the Popiſh Prelates, who withſtood the ſame. But how long, trow ye, did this continue? even ſo long, till by her authority, the Popiſh Biſhops were repreſſed, he himſelf, and his adherents, were brought in, and well ſetled, and thereby made ſtrong enough to undertake the matters of Reformation themſelves. Then loe, they began to make ſmall account of her Supremacy, nor would longer reſt on her Authority,*

rity, but took the Cauſe into their own hand, &c. *I will apply it thus, And then putting his Hand to his Hat, His Majeſty ſaid, My Lords, the Biſhops, I may thank you, that theſe Men thus plead for my Supremacy: they think they cannot make their party good againſt you, but by appealing to it; as if you, or ſome that adhere unto you, were not well affected towards it. But if once you were out, and they in place, I know what would become of my Supremacy.* With the like reaſon I may apply it again to our preſent buſineſs; there are certain men that ring perpetually in our ears, *the Doctrine of the Church of* England, *the Doctrine of the Church of* England: as if they were the moſt afraid of innovations in it, and were the moſt zealous aſſertors, and ſtrongeſt ſupporters of it. Whereas the truth is, they are beat from all other holds, and hope to ſhelter themſelves a little *by appealing to it: as if ſome among us were not well-affected towards it.* But if once their opponents were out, and they in their places, with a power to ſettle matters among us; *I know what would become of the Doctrine of the Church of* England; which they would no more value than an old Almanack quite out of date.

But I intend not to make a Book of this, and therefore have ſaid enough to demonſtrate the *Firſt* part of your aſſertion is not true; *that an Epiſcopal Calviniſt is the rightеſt Son or Father of the Church of* England. As for the *Second*, That he is, *if a good man, the beſt Chriſtian*; I have far more to ſay, than I am willing to Print. It is ſufficient to tell you, that I have known indeed ſundry good men of that way, who I verily believe would have been much better, if they had not been of it. And others I have known, who have ſtained their gooodneſs, with ſuch irregular actions, and ſiniſter practices and dealings, as I believe they would not have been guilty of, had not their Principles betrayed them into them. And laſtly, I am apt to think that you your ſelf would have been more charitable

table in your cenſures, more indifferent in your judgement, concerning Men and things, more civil and courteous in your treatment of thoſe you oppoſe, leſs captious, leſs partial, and not ſo peremptory as you are in many places of your Book, if you had not been a *Calvinian*: but I will not diſpute on which *ſide* (would to God we could uſe no ſuch word, but as we are *one Body*, ſo were indeed all One) the beſt Chriſtians are, nor which Principles are apt to make the beſt. Let us all ſincerely endeavour to *excell in Vertue*, and be glad that any can outſtrip us, though they be not in all things of our mind; which will be far better than contending about precedency, or about any thing elſe whatſoever.

Here now we might fairly part; but that I believe you will be apt to think, either I have nothing to ſay, or dare ſay nothing, of that about which you make ſo many ſad complaints, if I ſhould wholly paſs by the points of *juſtification by Faith, and the imputed Righteouſneſs of Chriſt*. With the ſame proviſion therefore, that you will not accuſe me for medling with that which did not concern me, I will add a few words about thoſe matters.

And I aſſure you, I abhorr the man, as much as you can do, who ſhall teach me otherwiſe, than our Church doth, *Artic.* XI. that *we are accounted righteous before God, only for the merits of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, by Faith, and not for our own Works or Deſervings. And therefore it is a moſt wholeſome Doctrine, and full of Comfort, that we are juſtified by Faith only.* But I verily think, there are none that teach otherwiſe; but you have wholly miſtaken thoſe Perſons, whoſe Writings have given you the trouble of making this Book. For though we are juſtified by Faith only, yet you acknowledge p. 37. that *all Chriſtian Vertues are connate with that Faith.* Which grants all that Mr. *Bull* contends for; whoſe poſition is, that the Faith which juſtifies contains in it a ſincere purpoſe of a new life.

life. O but none of those vertues (you add) *pass into the cause of justification*, No, nor is Faith it self any cause of it; not so much as an instrumental cause; and therefore you ought not to have quarrelled with Mr. *Bull* about this matter; who detests any such thoughts as you impose on him, that our good Works *are required casually, and antecedently* to our justification, p. 39. No such absurd Notion is to be found, I will stand to it, in his Book; nor lyes I am sure, in his Head. He is not so weak, so unstudied a Divine, as to make any thing that we can do, the cause of that, which God alone can bestow upon us. He doth not so much as require good Works *antecedently* to our entrance into the state of Justification; but only the purpose of them: which you your self acknowledge to be included, together with all Christian Vertues, in that Faith which justifies. And indeed Bishop *Davenant*, whom you deservedly applaud, affirms, as he shows, that those internal good Works are necessary to our justification, though not as *efficient or meritorious causes*, yet as *concurring or previous conditions*.

There is but one clause which can bring you off, and excuse you in this business, which you wisely insert, when you speak of Mr. *Bull's* Doctrine [*if at least*, say you, *I can understand him.*] I know not what you *can* do, but I am sure you *do not* understand him. And therefore ought to have suspected also, that you did not rightly understand Bishop *Nicholson's* Books; rather than have said so confidently as you do, *doubtless Mr.* Bull *imposes very far upon the Bishop*, when he saith, the Bishop read, approved, commended his Book, and wish'd him to publish it. This is very uncivil, and hardly to be reconciled with Christian Charity, which teaches us *to think no evil, to believe all things, and to hope all things*, when the contrary doth not evidently appear. It would have been but bare modesty in you, to have thought you did not apprehend the meaning of a Writer,

in

in matters of controverſie about *Faith*; rather than have accuſed a Divine (of no mean credit, I aſſure you in his Countrey) of falſifying ſo impudently in a matter of *Fact*, which he avows to the world, and to the Biſhop himſelf (to whom he dedicates his Work) to be a moſt real Truth. When you conſider it, you will acknowledge, I hope, between God and your own Soul, this was too raſh and peremptory (to ſpeak gently) and not becoming one of the beſt ſort of Chriſtians.

Which if you, and I too, will both of us ſtudy to be, I think verily it is beſt for us not to trouble our ſelves with nice diſquiſitions, about theſe matters, wherein we find Divines cannot well agree, about the way, I mean, of Faith's juſtifying us. It may ſuffice us, I ſhould think, to know, what our *Liturgy* teaches us plainly in both the *Abſolutions*, that God *pardoneth and abſolveth all them that truely repent, and unfeignedly believe his Holy Goſpel* (as it is in the Abſolution pronounced every day) having *promiſed forgiveneſs of ſins to all them that with hearty repentance, and true Faith turn to him*; as it is in that at the Holy Communion. Let us receive this glad tidings upon our bended knees, and with moſt joyful hearts, thankfully devoted to his ſervice; and leave thoſe that liſt to diſpute about the particular act of Faith that juſtifies; and how it is inſtrumental, as they ſpeak, in the buſineſs of Juſtification; and whether there be ſuch a thing as a paſſive Inſtrument, and what Repentance hath to do in this matter. No body ſhall ever perſwade me, but we ſhall have the benefit of the Abſolution, though we be not able to reſolve theſe queſtions, or though we never think of them, *If we truely repent, and unfeignedly believe Chriſt's Holy Goſpel*; or, which is the ſame, *With hearty Repentance, and true Faith turn to him.*

And in like manner (to ſpeak a word or two in the other point) we are ſufficiently inſtructed in our *Litanie*, as I underſtand it, to expect to be *delivered* (from our ſins, I ſuppoſe, and the puniſhment due to them) by the whole Humiliation, and exaltation of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt: when it teaches us to pray, *By the myſtery of thy Holy Incarnation; by thy Holy Nativity and Circumciſion, by thy Baptiſme, Faſting and Temptation, by thine Agony and Bloudy ſweat; by thy Croſs and Paſſion, by thy precious Death and Burial; by thy Glorious Reſurrection and Aſcenſion; and by the coming of the Holy Ghoſt, Good Lord deliver us.* It is plain, that whoſoever minds what he prays, truſts to be delivered by Chriſt alone; who impetrated this Mercy for us, and beſtows it on us, by *his Incarnation*, *Nativity*, *Circumciſion*, and all the reſt now mentioned. But what hand each of theſe hath, diſtinct from the other, in procuring our deliverance, and how each of them merits for us, and makes us to be *accounted righteous before God*; and wherein the merit of his life differs, from that of his Death and Paſſion, and is applied to us by his Reſurrection, Aſcenſion, and coming of the Holy Ghoſt; we need not, I hope, very ſolicitouſly enquire. For Juſtification is not a Bleſſing that belongs only to Scholars and ſubtil Wits, but to the plaineſt Countreyman of us all; who pray, and hope to be *delivered*, by all that Chriſt hath done and ſuffered for us; whoſe righteouſneſs in both regards, was ſo pure and perfect that God in conſideration of it (or for its merits) was pleaſed Graciouſly to grant *us* forgiveneſs of ſins, and *him* a power to beſtow it on all thoſe that believe on his name: which is as much as to ſay, that we are accounted righteous for the ſake of Chriſts merits, or for the merits, if you will, of Chriſts righteouſneſs; the effects and fruits of which we are made partakers of by Faith. So the Church teaches us to underſtand *Chriſt's imputed righteouſneſs* (which all good Chriſtians

Chriſtians rejoyce in.) For righteouſneſs imputed, is our *being accounted righteous before God*, though we are not ſo in our ſelves, and we are accounted righteous before God, ſaith the 11 Artic. *only for the merits of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, by Faith; and not for our own works and deſerving.*

If you will trouble your ſelf with notions beyond this, you may; but do not trouble others with them, who profeſs they cannot underſtand how the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt can be ſo accounted ours (which is the modern notion of it) as if in him we had performed perfect obedience to God. He performed perfect Obedience *for us*; (that we believe and hope to be ſaved by the merit of it;) but we *did not* perform perfect obedience in him; (that is contrary, I have been taught to the very principles of Chriſtianity.) For if we did, then by that perfect obedience performed in him, we become perfectly righteous; free, that is, not only from all puniſhment, but from fault; and then we have no need of pardon, nor of any inherent righteouſneſs, and we have merited a reward.

For my part I believe the honeſt people of the Church of *England*, who devoutly ſay the *Litanie*, never think of any ſuch thing, but humbly addreſs themſelves to God for mercy, through the merits and mediation of Jeſus Chriſt, who hath purchaſed pardon for penitent ſinners, by the intire righteouſneſs of his life and death. They mean no more, when they pray to be delivered by his wonderful condeſcenſion, in being incarnate for our ſake (which was the beginning of his humiliation) and by his bloudy death and burial (in which it was finiſhed) but that they may be freed from the guilt of their ſins, and the puniſhment due to them, by the merits of theſe, and all other parts of his humiliation: which they know, by his exaltation into the heavens, and the coming of the Holy

Ghoſt, was highly acceptable to God; being the fulfilling of all his Will, in what he required for our redemption; and having obtained for our Saviour, all power in Heaven and Earth, to diſpenſe the Bleſſings which he purchaſed. And thus other Churches underſtand this buſineſs, the *French* for inſtance, who ſay; *We believe that our righteouſneſs conſiſts in remiſſion of ſins*, &c. *and therefore caſting away all opinion of our own vertues and merits, we reſt only in the obedience of Chriſt Jeſus; which is imputed to us both, that all our ſins may be covered, and alſo that we may obtain Grace before God.* Here they plainly tell us, that their *righteouſneſs* (which is procured by Chriſts obedience) *conſiſts in remiſſion of ſins*; and therefore that obedience of his, is imputed only in this ſenſe; that for its ſake we may obtain remiſſion of ſins, and be accepted with God.

I beſeech you, Sir, do not accuſe me of Heterodoxy, if I do not jump with your thoughts in theſe matters: for I proteſt I have no inclinations to faſten a ſenſe upon the Churches words out of my own head; but would moſt gladly receive it from thoſe that can inform me better about it. And I have a great reſpect alſo, for all good men that are of a different mind in theſe matters: and reverence Mr. *Calvin* very much, though I do not think my ſelf bound to follow his opinions. All I deſire is, that neither you nor any body elſe would keep a pudder and a ſtirr, as if Chriſtianity were in danger to be loſt by I know not what new notions; when Mr. *Bull*, and all that I have heard of his way, preach the Grace of God, in ſuch a manner as I have declared: which makes me confident our Religion and the Church is ſafe, if they have no worſe enemies than he. But I much fear they are none of the Churches friends (though they may deſign its good) who make ſuch a noiſe, as if all our antient, moſt fundamental Doctrines were ſubverted. For the love of God, Sir, Let us hear no more of this from your hand, if you bear any

good

good will to it. Let us have no more diſcourſes of *innovations* in our Doctrines; no more *Truths unveiled* (though you think your ſelf never ſo well acquainted, with them) no more *Vindications*, nor mention of Mr. *Standiſh*: who being the only perſon concerned, hath as became an honeſt and good man, acknowledged his error by ſilence. I pray, Sir, do not you therefore revive that, which he thinks fit ſhould dye, and be no more heard of. I dare ſay for him, he will give you no thanks for your kind intentions to ſerve him; and therefore do not ſtudy how to oblige him any further in this matter. He honours ſeveral of thoſe perſons, I make no doubt, as true Sons of the Church of *England*; whom you have loaded with the reproach of departing from its Doctrine. You have done him a great deal of injury in endeavouring to make the world believe, that he ſtruck at Dr. *Hammond*, Biſhop *Taylor*, or Biſhop *Mountague* either. Nothing I am confident was further from his thoughts, and he wiſhes, I am of opinion, that he had been as far out of yours. For it was untowardly done to bring him upon the ſtage again, right or wrong; when he had no mind to perſiſt in making a breach among us, as he had in an heat begun to do.

But he will take it kindly, I am apt to think, if you will not ſeek to make him any reparation for this wrong: but leave him to juſtify himſelf his own way. He may well forgive you all that is paſt, for one conſiderable ſervice you have done him (and the only one that I can find) which is, that I hope you have opened his eyes to ſee, that I was in the right when I told him (in my requeſt to him) what ſort of men he would gratify by thoſe paſſages in his Sermon. Even ſuch as accuſe our late great Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, for being *an incourager of the Romiſh Faction* (as you do in expreſs terms, p. 28.) *i. e.* betraying his Truſt, and this Church; which he ſo affectionately ſerved,

that

that it coſt him his life. It was not enough it ſeems, that they brought him in his life time, *under the Prophets affliction* (as he complains to our late Martyred Soveraign in his Epiſtle before his admirable Book againſt *Fiſher*) *between the mouth that ſpeaks wickedneſs, and the tongue that ſets forth deceit, and ſlandered him as thick, as if he were not their own Mothers Son:* but he muſt ſtill be perſecuted with the ſame calumnies, now that he is laid in his Grave.

But it is no wonder that Pen ſhould do it, which beſtows ſuch commendations on him, who reproaches, not only *our* Biſhops, but the moſt famous perſons of that Order, which have been known in the Chriſtian world, I mean the *facetious and candid Marvel* (as you praiſe him, p. 34.) with whom *honeſt Mr. Standiſh* (as you there truly term him) will not take it well to be joyned in the very ſame breath; as if he carried on the ſame deſign with that Gentleman. He is an honeſter man, I dare ſay, than you would have him; and hates that which you applaud with all his heart. What? do you really think a Son of the Church of *England* can be in love with him, that laughs at the *primitive* times, and makes a jeſt of the venerable *Council of Nice*, and drolls upon the *Biſhops* aſſembled there, as if they were a company of pitiful Dunces, whoſe *underſtandings were ſequeſtred*, and knew not what to believe, but as they were every day inſtructed by their Chaplains. p. 58. Call you this *Facetiouſneſs*? And is it *Candor* too, when he tells us in his *Rehearſal Tranſpros'd*, that the *higheſt pinnacle of Eccleſiaſtical Felicity*, (for the Clergy ſtill have moſt of his kindneſs) *is to aſſwage their luſt, and wrack their malice.* p. 10. And when in the concluſion of his laſt work, we read, that the *Biſhops have induced His Majeſty to more ſeverity, than all the Reigns ſince the Conqueſts will contain, if ſumm'd up together?* What? Not Queen *Maries* Reign excepted? No, nor the late Reign of the *Preſbyterians* and *Independants*? Were the *flames in* Smithfield,

and

and all the *Sequeſtrations*——(I am loth to mention all the reſt of the dreadful ſufferings) which our times have known, mere gentleneſs, in compariſon with the preſent rigors? When with ſo much lenity alſo, as was never known in any Reign, ſuch Books as theſe are ſuffered, to confute their own accuſations?

Good God! how partial are the beſt ſort of Chriſtians grown (if you may be believed) who can ſwallow all this glibly and merrily, with a great deal of ſmuttineſs to boot (which I have obſerved in the *Rehearſal Tranſpros'd*) but keck at Dr. *Hammond*, and the *Whole Duty of Man.* &c. which will by no means down with them? What an odd kind of Conſcience is this, which cryes out, *How long O Lord, how long?* (p. 35. as if you wondred at his forbearance) becauſe ſome men ſpeak of juſtifying Faith in other terms than you would have them: and can, not only ſuffer, but countenance him, who directly ſtrikes at a main Principle of Chriſtianity; *viz.* That our Saviour is *the Eternal Son of God, begotten before all worlds, of one ſubſtance with the Father.* For he ſaith the Council of *Nice* impoſed a *NEW ARTICLE or Creed upon the Chriſtian world:* when this was the very thing they ſtood upon, that they only declared the antient belief, which had always been from the beginning, concerning the Son of God. What outcries would you have made, had any perſon of our Church been guilty of ſuch a fact? How prophane, how impious would you have thought it, to call that explication which they made of the antient Faith, *a gibberiſh of their own impoſing: a Cant, wherein they forced others to follow them?* How oft would you have repeated, your *facinus ante hoc inauditum*? p. 35. and reiterated your *Heu*! in the next pages, whereas you can read this in him, and be as calm as a Lamb; nay, entertain him with the friendly complement of the *facetious and candid Marvel.*

Well,

Well, I ſee by this what the care is, which ſome moſt zealouſly pretend to have, leaſt there ſhould be the ſmalleſt innovation in the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, which expreſly declares in the 8 Article, that the *Nicene Creed* (together with that of *Athanaſius*, and the *Apoſtles*) *ought to be thorowly received and believed*; *for they may be proved by moſt certain warrants of Holy Scripture.* And in the *Second Article* it aſſerts, in plain words, the Son to be the very Eternal God, of *one ſubſtance with the Father*, &c. Such is the gibberiſh of the Church of *England* (as he (and you too in effect call it:) for which, if you were indeed as much concerned as you imagine, and did not deceive your ſelf with an unequal zeal; you would ſo reaſon upon this occaſion (as you fancy you do upon another) *to beblur your paper with Tears more than Ink.* For you cannot pretend that any of thoſe whom you trouble your ſelf ſo much withal, have affronted her Doctrine in ſo audacious a manner, as this Writer hath done; whom you can read, not only with dry Eyes, but with a merry Heart. There would have been no end of your complaints, could you have found any thing ſo black in our Books, we ſhould have had our ears filled with clamours from all parts of the Kingdom; and nothing ſounded in them, but that Chriſtianity was betrayed, the name of our Lord blaſphemed, *&c.* by an impious Innovator. You your ſelf, though now you be ſilent, would have joyned with them, and ſaid that he *had out-done all others in ſcurrility, calumny, and prophaneneſs*; as you accuſe others that deſerve a better character; you would have ſobb'd and ſigh'd, and ſate down full of Marvel (you muſt give me leave to fancy, how you would have ſpoken) and in deep aſtoniſhment that ſuch a thing, ſuch an *inauditum facinus*, ſhould be committed in our *Iſrael.*

And

And truly I am ſo aſtoniſhed at it, and at your partiality, that I am able to go no further; but muſt here break off abruptly: After I have told you, that I am notwithſtanding ſo charitable (looking upon you in an ill fit when you writ this Book) that as you take me for an honeſt Countrey Gentleman, ſo I take you for no leſs; which of us is miſtaken, let the world judge, without giving it any further trouble by either of our ſcriblings about this buſineſs. It had not been troubled with mine, I aſſure you, but that I thought it was neceſſary you ſhould ſee, your Zeal cannot be ſo great for one way; but there are men in the Church of *England* who will equal it, and are as much concern'd, and can ſay as much for the other way. And now that this is done, let us betake our ſelves to our Prayers, which is the beſt employment, That God would enlighten all our Eyes, to ſee the way of Truth and Righteouſneſs, *Amen.*

Octob. 20.
1676.

FINIS.